



72
AF/

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Thomas GOSTELOW

Serial No. 10/643,939

Filed: August 20, 2003

For: MEDICO-SURGICAL
INSTRUMENTS

EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Art Unit: 3771

Examiner: Dixon, Annette Frericka

Atty Docket: 0119/0024

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL
FILED PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.116

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The following is a response to the Office Action dated December 1, 2006 in which the examiner has finally rejected all of the pending claims based on the same rejections under the same references, and with the same comments as were set forth in the previous Office Action of June 14, 2006.

Given that there is nothing new in terms in the latest Office Action other than the response to arguments in item 22 of the Office Action, applicant responds by incorporating by reference the same arguments that were set forth in the Amendment dated September 12, 2006.

In light of the examiner's response in item 22 of the Office Action, to further point out the differences between the prior art devices as disclosed in Sauer (US 6,109,264), Furtune et al. (US 5,507,279), Toye (US 6,382,209), and Yoon (US 5,423,760), being submitted with this response are two articles entitled "Evaluation of a New Emergency